

## **REMARKS**

The examiner has rejected claims 1-9 as being obvious over Kaufman (#5,201,164) in view of Foster et al (#6,063,226). Kaufman substantially shows the claimed subject matter including unwinding a supply roll (col. 2 lines 35+), dispensing solution onto the sheet. Kaufman discloses a preferable method is using perforated tubes for wetting the sheets (col. 2 lines 50+). Kaufman discloses that the sheet is slit into eight ribbons and folded into a z-fold configuration as an example (col. 2 lines 60+). Kaufman discloses slitting the sheet and wrapping the folded webs by combining sheets into a sausage. The eight continuous webs are read on the eight ribbons slit. Kaufman does not show the s-wrap rollers or folding plates as claimed. However, Foster et al show the use of S-wrap rollers 54, 55 which feed the material evenly and continuously through the system (col. 3 lines 60+). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Kaufman with S-wrap rollers as taught by Foster et al to feed the material evenly and continuously. Regarding the folding plates and type of fold configuration, such as, C, W or e fold configuration, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to use fold plates for folding as well as to form the particular fold configurations as claimed.

Claim 1 relates to a method for web folding and wetting comprising: dispensing webs from roll unwind stands and feeding the webs at a continuous speed via S-Wrap drive rollers. The webs are passed over stationary wetting tubes where wetting solution is dispensed onto the web. The web is passed onto folding plates, where the web is folded into "Z", "C", "W" or "e" fold configurations.

The Examiner states that Kaufman does not show the s-wrap rollers or folding plates as claimed. The Examiner then uses Forster in combination with Kaufman to show that the invention is obvious.

Kaufman relates to a method for improving the dispensing of stacked wet wipes. Kaufman compresses the wet wipe stack within the container prior to sealing the container, which improves the one at a time dispensing of the wipes. Each clip of wipes is separately wetted and thereafter combined to form a stack of wet wipes. The stack is placed into the dispensing container and sealed.

Foster relates to a method for manufacturing a file having a pocket. Foster is directed to a file folder, which includes a first and second sheet of flexible material. Figure 4 shows the system of Foster for applying the pocket to the file folder. The folder material of Foster is fed around a pair of driven S-wrap rollers, in order to feed the stock through the system. The S-wrap rollers are operatively connected to each other so they rotate at the same speed in order to feed the folder material evenly and continuously through the system.

There is no reason or teaching to combine the teachings of Kaufman and Foster. As stated above, Kaufman relates to a method of improving dispensing wipes, whereas Foster relates to manufacturing a file having a pocket. The references are totally unrelated and do not deal with solving the same problem. Therefore, claim 1 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 2 depends on claim 1 and states that the webs are used for cleaning and/or hygienic wiping.

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 2 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 3 depends on claim 1 and further comprises cutting the web into appropriate lengths.

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 3 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 4 depends on claim 1 and states that system folds and wets eight continuously moving webs.

Nowhere does either reference discuss or teach folding and wetting eight continuously moving webs. Further, for the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 4 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 5 depends on claim 3 and further comprises: dispensing a web of packaging material; slitting score lines into the packaging material; and wrapping the folded webs.

Kaufman relates to a method for improving the dispensing of stacked wet wipes. Kaufman compresses the wet wipe stack within a container prior to sealing the container, which improves the one at a time dispensing of the wipes. The stack of wipes is placed into the dispensing container and sealed.

Therefore, since the wipes described in Kaufman are all placed in a tub and then sealed, Kaufman cannot teach dispensing a web of packaging material that wraps the folded webs. Further, since Foster teaches a folder, the combination does not teach the elements of claim 5. Therefore claim 5 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 6 depends on claim 1 and further states that the web speed ranges from about 180" per minute to 900" per minute.

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 5 is not obvious over the prior art.

The Examiner states that Kaufman discloses that the liquid add-on was a certain weight percent based on the dry weight of the basesheet. Kaufman discloses that after the basesheet has been impregnated with the desired amount of liquid (col. 2 lines 55+), the sheet is slit. This infers that the basesheet is weighed with the correct amount of solution on it. Furthermore, it is well known in the art to weigh articles to reach predetermined weights. Lastly, it is well known in the art to manufacture optimal speed ranges and to control flow rates and to use control systems as claimed to monitor flow rates as claimed.

Claim 7 relates to the method of claim 1 wherein flow rate of the wetting solution is automatically adjusted by a control system to compensate for changing web speeds.

Kaufman does not teach or no inference can be drawn to the element that the flow rate of the wetting solution is adjusted to compensate for changing web speeds. Therefore claim 7 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 8 relates to method of claim 7 wherein the control system monitors and controls flow rates of solution dispensed.


For the reasons stated above for claim 7, claim 8 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 9 relates to the method of claim 1 wherein the web is weighed on line after wetting solution is dispensed on the web to see if correct amount of fluid has been added to the web.

The Examiner infers that the basesheet is weighed with the correct amount of solution on it. Furthermore, it is well known in the art to weigh articles to reach predetermined weights. Claim 9 requires that the web be weighed on line after the wetting solution is dispensed on it. While it may be inferred that the base sheet is weighed with correct solution on it, there is nothing taught or that can be inferred from the prior art references that the web is weighted online. Therefore claim 9 is not obvious over the prior art.

Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EV 685800853 US  
Date of Deposit: September 28, 2005  
I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on September 28, 2005

Signature:   
Name: Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,



Philip M. Weiss  
Reg. No. 34,751  
Attorney for Applicant  
Weiss & Weiss  
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251  
Mineola, NY 11501  
(516) 739-1500